

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite a second protective film laminated on another surface of the polarizer.. Further, new claims 32-36 have been added. Also, claim 8 has been amended to delete the word “additional” before “adhesive.”

Support for the added recitations is found in the original application, in particular on page 3, lines 1-3 (claims 32-33) in the Examples (claims 1 and 34-36) and on page 5, line 8 (claim 37).

Claims 1-37 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

In the Office Action, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. It is alleged in the Office Action that the expression “an additional adhesive layer” is unclear on the ground that “there is not a first adhesive layer.”

Claim 8 has been amended to delete the word “additional” before “adhesive.” Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, on pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the following rejections are made:

- claims 1-9, 18-20, 22-23, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 4,818,624 to Downey, Jr. (“Downey”),
- claim 21 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Downey,
- claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Downey in view of US 6,064,457 to Aminaka (“Aminaka”),

- claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Downey in view of US 4,620,772 to Sugimoto et al. (“Sugimoto”).

Also, on pages 9-10 of the Office Action, the following rejection is made:

- claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Downey in view of US 6,361,838 to Miyatake et al. (“Miyatake”).

Further, on pages 6-8 and 10-12 of the Office Action, the following rejections are made:

- claims 1-9, 18-23, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sugimoto in view of Downey,
- claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sugimoto in view of Downey and Miyatake, and
- claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sugimoto in view of Downey and Aminaka.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. Downey fails to teach or suggest a polarizing plate having first and second protective films, with the thickness relationship as recited in present claim 1.

In particular, in Downey, the polarizer is attached to a single substrate on one side, so as to perform the iodine and/or silylation treatment on the other side of the polarizer. Downey is silent as to any protective films.

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the polarizing plate provides a first protective film laminated on at least one surface of the polarizer, and a second protective film

laminated on another surface of the polarizer, wherein the polarizing plate satisfies a relationship of $0.01 \leq A/B1 \leq 0.16$, where A denotes a thickness of the polarizer and B1 denotes a thickness of the first protective film, as recited in present claim 1. An advantage of this feature is that the polarizer can be provided with dimensional stability effectively, as described in the present specification. This feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught or suggested in Downey, and the other cited references fail to remedy this deficiency. Therefore, for this reason, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination

Further, with respect to claims 32 and 34-37, Downey is also completely silent as to any thickness requirements for protective films or adhesive layers disposed on a polarizer, and with respect to claim 33, Downey discloses various materials but is completely silent as to triacetylcellulose film for a protective film. Thus, Downey fails to teach or suggest the respective features of claims 32-37, and the other cited references fail to remedy this deficiency. Therefore, for this reason, each of claims 32-37 are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

With respect to the other dependent claims, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the combinations of features as recited in these claims. Therefore, for these respective reasons, the other dependent claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/780,668
Attorney Docket No. 020581A

Additionally, regarding the last two paragraphs on pages 3 and 7 of the Office Action, it is noted that original claims 8-9 were the claims of the parent reciting an A/B relationship, whereas, in this continuation application, an A/B relationship was recited in original claim 1. Also, unlike in the parent application, original claim 1 in this continuation application did not recite a shrinkage ratio.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 44,373

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep